From:	roadsafetystrategy@infrastructure.gov.au on behalf of Office of Road Safety <roadsafetystrategy@infrastructure.gov.au>
Sent:	Saturday, 20 March 2021 11:38 PM
To:	RoadSafetyStrategy
Subject:	National Road Safety Strategy 2021-30 - have your say submission - Anne [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Attachments:	national-road-safety-strategy-2021-30-response.docx

Submitted on Sat, 2021-03-20 23:35

Submitted values are:

Name
Anne

Email
████████████████████

State
Qld

Which area/s of the draft Strategy are you commenting on (select all that apply):
Targets for reducing deaths and serious injuries , The themes – safe roads, safe road use, safe vehicles and speed management , Movement and place, The social model , Data and performance management, Governance, Infrastructure planning and investment , Regional roads , Remote areas, Vehicle safety , Heavy vehicle safety , Workplace road safety, Indigenous Australians, Vulnerable road users , Risky road use , Other/not listed

What is your primary area of interest in road safety?
the fatal 5

What road safety issues are the most important to address?
the fatal 5
fair policies for regional, rural and remote road users
adequate funding for areas outside metropolitan areas

Is there anything important that you think is missing from this draft Strategy?
community consultation.
A lack of understanding in what it like to live, work or visit regional, rural and remote areas of Australia

Do you give permission for your submission to be published on this website following the end of the consultation period?
Yes

National Road Safety Strategy 2021-30 Response

There appears to be a common theme throughout this strategy – to reduce speed limits; especially in regional, rural and remote areas. This is grossly unfair to those of us who choose to live in, or have lived in, or need to visit such areas. The distances between towns is already a challenge as it can take a minimum of 1-2 hours to get to the nearest destination in regional areas and far longer in remote areas. Reducing the speed limit to make this distance take even longer is not only unfair but it also introduces new challenges such as boredom and distraction; which are also part of the fatal 5. Is it wise to replace one Fatal 5 component with another?

I believe it would be reasonable for me to assume, after reading this paper; that those who are involved in the document currently don't, and possibly never have, lived in a rural, regional or remote community.

It is disappointing that the general public is unaware of this document and as such hasn't been given the opportunity to contribute to it. I believe every road user should be able to have a say. The only real way to have everybody involved in road safety is to involve everyone In the process. To have community based consultation involves consulting the community, not a selected portion of it.

Personally I have lost close family and friends to road crashes. I also am the child of an ambulance officer and my father was more than willing to talk about his experiences.

I would like nothing more than to achieve a zero road toll but I also feel that the strategy on offer is very biased to city drivers and discriminates against regional, rural and remote drivers.

I believe speed doesn't kill – stopping or the way you stop possibly does.

I also think it may be fair to say that speed probably isn't the initial cause of a crash but it can increase the severity of the result. Work should be done on the initial cause.

A 100km/hr crash has the same effect on the body wherever it occurs but the theme in this strategy is that a higher speed is acceptable in areas that are not regional, rural or remote.

Every road user deserves to be able to have the opportunity to:

learn defensive driving techniques

experience vehicle handling situations

learn vehicle capabilities and vulnerabilities

understand the ability and vulnerability of the human body in road trauma

Most of the above either aren't available to the average road user or are unaffordable. If any of the above could mean a life saved wouldn't they be worth investing in?

Comments on specific pages

Page 5 discusses road deaths and hospitalised injuries in major city, regional & remote locations. Are these statistics for an instant fatality or if someone dies alter as a result of a crash?

Obviously first responders/emergency services response times and medical treatment/intervention will affect the prognosis of a seriously injured person, and unless these statistics are separated it won't help to solve the problem of lowering the road toll. An injured person found and treated immediately would probably have a much better chance of survival than a casualty discovered after a period of time. Often regional, rural and remote crashes occur hours before anyone comes across them.

I'm sure regional, rural & remote citizens are also less likely to survive heart attacks, workplace injuries and non-vehicle accidents for the same reason – help isn't readily available.

Hospitalisation is also too broad a statistic as its definition is "for any period of time". Broken bones, concussion and stitches may require short term hospitalisation and it is unfair to class these injuries the same as a trauma victim.

Page 6 mentions speed management to reduce trauma in urban, regional & remote communities. What is the definition of each of these?

It seems, from reading the strategy, that it is believed that speed management is the only answer. I'm sure rural, regional and remote citizens would disagree. Wildlife, livestock, sun glare, boredom, distraction & road conditions would be other reasons that do contribute to crashes and can be managed if Governments wish to spend money in these areas.

Page 7 – rural, regional and remove don't feature in the graph

Page 9 Admission to hospital needs to be better defined. The mention that the statistic on hospital admission is irrespective of the length of stay is not fair – hospital admission could be for just a few hours to observe a patient or to set a broken bone. Neither of these should be considered in the statistics that are used to determine road safety policy.

There is also mention that the Strategy has adopted per capita rates – what does this mean? Does this disadvantage regional, rural and remote locations?

Page 11 – there is no mention of involving all road users in this strategy -why?

Page 13 – speed management is above safe roads, vehicles, and road use : surely it isn't a greater priority than the others?

Page 14 –Wramborgs model is only probability not actual –there should be enough statistics to be able to do this graph with real statistics; which I believe would not support this strategy. This model is more than 15 years old.

There seems to be Government reliance on revenue collection, via fixed and mobile devices rather than a higher police present to act as a deterrent on the roads. It is an enforcement and penalty system rather than a reward and recognition system; which naturally convinces people that is a revenue raising exercise.

Page 15 – there needs to be a clear definition of what a regional, rural and a remote road are.

Regional Roads

It says that 55% of road crash deaths in regions are from regional areas – that is because city people tend not to go to regional areas so obviously those involved in crashes would be locals.

I interpret this section to mean that as Governments won't spend money on infrastructure improvements speed limits will need to be reduced – which is penalising country people for the failings of Government. Any road outside a capital city or adjacent high density population area would suffer speed reductions because Governments can't or won't spend money outside these high density areas. This disadvantages those living outside these areas and once again means replacing one fatal 5 for another.

Page 16 – Remote areas

Relatively high speed limits means? A 100 km/hr speed limit has the same effect on the body whether it is in a remote area or a major metropolitan area.

How will comprehensive risk reduction on roads be achieved?

Page 17 Workplace road safety

There needs to be an acceptance and provision for separate transport corridors for pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists and vehicles. Mixing any combination leads to potential hazards

Indigenous Australians

This should be adopted for all categories of road users

Page 18

Vulnerable road users

There needs to be a greater emphasis on the road rules for all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists. If a child can learn to swim at 6 months they can be taught the road rules applicable to pedestrians as toddlers. Parents need to teach and be role models for their kids.

As for motorbike riders, I believe the NSW system that allows a motorbike licence to be obtained prior to a car licence is advantageous and teaches awareness skills which will be invaluable after obtaining a car licence. As a bike rider you need to be extremely aware of

your surroundings and when you drive a car you are then aware of the ease of manoeuvrability of a motorcycle and the importance of blind spot checking.

Novice drivers should also be allowed to be exposed to defensive driving techniques and be allowed to experience vehicle handling situations and be made aware of vehicle capabilities and vulnerabilities.

Young drivers also have misconceptions about the ability of the human body because of exposure to video games and movies. They also haven't had a lot of exposure to real life experiences due to lack of outdoor activities growing up; which is a new age dilemma.

Learner drivers (not just for cars) should be taught to drive and not just to pass a driving test. Competency based training should be mandatory for all heavy vehicles.

Page 23

Road users are not included in the consultation process and they should be.

Further notes

All children should be encouraged to be pedestrians and pushbike riders to learn basic road safety before becoming motorists.

"Deadman" switches could be installed in cars to alleviate distraction and fatigue. Obviously they wouldn't need to be activated as regularly as a train one is. Also make alcohol/drug interlocking systems mandatory for all new vehicles

Vehicles should have activation codes like mobile phones do; to prevent theft and joyriding

Cruise control should be banned; to avoid driver boredom and distraction. It may also be the cause of high speed impact if the driver hasn't or couldn't apply the brakes and prevents the vehicle from slowing itself